

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, April 9, 2007
Volume 43—Number 14
Pages 395–427

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

See also Meetings With Foreign Leaders
California, remarks to military personnel and
their families at Fort Irwin—417
Commander in Chief's Trophy, presentation
to the U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen—
406
Health savings accounts, meeting—406
Radio address—395

Communications to Congress

Korea, letter transmitting notification of
intention to enter into a free trade
agreement—405

Executive Orders

Establishing an Emergency Board To
Investigate a Dispute Between Metro-North
Railroad and Its Maintenance of Way
Employees Represented by the
International Brotherhood of Teamsters—
422
Renaming a National Forest in the
Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—409

Interviews With the News Media

News conferences
March 31 with President Lula da Silva of
Brazil at Camp David, MD—396
April 3—409

Joint Statements

Joint Statement on the Occasion of the Visit
by President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva of
Brazil to Camp David—403

Letters and Messages

Easter 2007, message—424
Passover, 5767, message—408

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Brazil, President Lula da Silva—396, 403

Notices

Notice of Intention To Enter Into a Free
Trade Agreement With Korea—405

Proclamations

400th Anniversary of Jamestown—424
National Former Prisoner of War Recognition
Day—423
Pan American Day and Pan American
Week—422

Statements by the President

Death of Edward G. Robinson—421

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—427
Checklist of White House press releases—426
Digest of other White House
announcements—425
Nominations submitted to the Senate—426

Editor's Note: The President was at the Bush Ranch in Crawford, TX, on April 6, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is also available on the Internet on the GPO Access service at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/wcomp/index.html>.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

US GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
Washington DC 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Penalty for private use, \$300

PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
GPO
PERMIT NO. G-26

Week Ending Friday, April 6, 2007

The President's Radio Address

March 31, 2007

Good morning. In recent days, the House and Senate each passed emergency war spending bills that undercut our troops in the field. Each of the Democrats' bills would substitute the judgment of politicians in Washington for that of our generals on the ground. Each bill would impose restrictive conditions on our military commanders. Each bill would also set an arbitrary deadline for surrender and withdrawal in Iraq, and I believe that would have disastrous consequences for our safety here at home.

The Democrats loaded up their bills with billions of dollars in domestic spending completely unrelated to the war, including \$3.5 million for visitors to tour the Capitol, \$6.4 million for the House of Representatives' salaries and expenses account, and \$74 million for secure peanut storage. I like peanuts as much as the next guy, but I believe the security of our troops should come before the security of our peanut crop. For all these reasons, that is why I made it clear to the Democrats in Congress, I will veto the bill.

Democrats in the House and the Senate also recently passed their annual budget resolutions. Their budgets would raise your taxes and raise Government spending in Washington. And their budgets fail to address the most serious challenge to our Nation's fiscal health: the unsustainable growth in entitlement programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Overall, the Democrats would raise taxes by a total of nearly \$400 billion over the next 5 years. To put this in perspective, this would be the largest tax increase in our Nation's history, even larger than the tax increase the Democrats passed the last time they controlled Congress.

Let me explain what it will mean for your annual tax bill if the Democrats get their way. If you have children, the Democrats would

raise your taxes by \$500 for each child. If you're a family of four making \$60,000 a year, the Democrats would raise your taxes by more than \$1,800. If you're a single mother with two children working to make ends meet, the Democrats would raise your taxes by more than \$1,000. If you are a small-business owner working to meet a payroll, the Democrats would raise your taxes by almost \$4,000. And more than five million low-income Americans who currently pay no income taxes because of our tax relief would once again have to pay. Whether you have a family, work for a living, own a business, or are simply struggling to get by on a low income, the Democrats want to raise your taxes.

The Democrats plan to spend all those extra tax dollars. In the Senate, Democrats have passed a budget that would spend \$145 billion more than I have requested over the next 5 years. In the House, Democrats have passed a budget that would spend even more—\$213 billion above my request.

With their budgets, the Democrats have revealed their true intentions. During the last campaign, Democrats said that under their pay as you go approach, they would pay for their new spending. Now we see what they meant by that. The Democrats have chosen a tax as you go approach that requires you to cut your spending to pay higher taxes. And Democrats will use these higher taxes to spend more of your money on their special interest projects.

Our Nation cannot afford such reckless taxing and spending. Under my administration, we have kept your taxes low and restrained Government spending in Washington. Now America's economy is leading the world, with an economic expansion that has produced 42 months of uninterrupted job growth and created more than 7.5 million new jobs. The fastest way to stop this growth in its tracks would be to allow the Democrats

in Congress to impose higher taxes on you so they can spend more of your money.

I believe there's a better way to balance our Federal budget. Last month, I sent Congress a plan that would eliminate the Federal deficit in 5 years, without raising your taxes. In the months ahead, I will work with Republicans and responsible Democrats in Congress to pass a disciplined budget and to stop the Democratic leadership from taking our Nation back to tax-and-spend policies of the past. By setting clear spending priorities and keeping taxes low, we can keep our economy growing, support our troops in the war on terror, and ensure our children and grandchildren inherit a more prosperous and hopeful America.

Thank you for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 9:15 a.m. on March 30 in the Cabinet Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on March 31. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on March 30 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of this address.

The President's News Conference With President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva of Brazil at Camp David, Maryland

March 31, 2007

President Bush. Mr. President, welcome to Camp David. Laura and I are delighted you're here. This is a special spot for Laura and me, and it was my honor to welcome you to this part of America. You come as a friend; we welcome you as a friend; and our discussions were very friendly.

We talked about a lot of areas of mutual concern. We talked about what I would call mutual opportunities. We talked about, of course, trade. Brazil and America trade a lot. Perhaps the most compelling part of the opportunity to work together is for the Doha round. It's in the U.S. interests that we complete the Doha round successfully. It is in—I think it's in Brazil's interests—at least that's the way the President has told me. I don't want to put words in his mouth. But it is in our interest to work together to make sure

that we have a deal that treats Brazil fairly, the United States fairly, as well as other nations fairly.

I strongly believe that the best way to help alleviate world poverty is through trade. And so we had yet another constructive dialog. We had a good dialog there in Sao Paulo, and here in Camp David we have as well.

Interestingly enough, we announced the creation of a U.S.-Brazil CEO Forum. It's a opportunity for people in our respective countries to get to know each other better and to strengthen economic ties as well as social ties.

We talked about biofuels. I can remember very well, Mr. President, going to the Petrobras plant. It was an amazing facility, and it was exciting for me to see the realities of your biofuels industry firsthand. I'm a big believer in alternative fuels. There's a whole new industry here in the United States beginning to spring up. And I told the President that not only are we committed domestically to promoting a alternative fuel industry; we're committed to working with Brazil. And that's why we support the President's initiative on the International Biofuels Forum, as well as the initiative that we talked about in Sao Paulo, and signed a memorandum of understanding, and that is to help nations in our own hemisphere realize the benefits of ethanol and biodiesel.

I appreciate the President's very strong commitment to democracy. I also appreciate his very strong commitment to help nations, particularly on the continent of Africa. And one of the really exciting initiatives that we will work together on is an initiative to eradicate malaria in Sao Tome and Principe, two opportunities for Brazil and the United States to work together to improve somebody's life.

There is no excuse for malaria to continuing to kill as many people as it does. Our great nations can work together to stop that death. There is a reasonable plan in place. It's a plan that I'm confident can achieve great success, and it makes a lot of sense for Brazil and the United States to work toward that plan.

As I said in Sao Paulo, Mr. President, I appreciate very much your leadership on Haiti. I appreciate the fact that you've led

the U.N. stabilization force. We want to, of course, make sure that your efforts to bring security are followed up by opportunity for the people of Haiti. We don't want your force just to be there to simply stabilize; we want your force to leave—be a part of a constructive future, which is precisely your vision. And we want to work with you very closely to achieve that end.

We spent a lot of time talking about other parts of the world, and that's what you would expect when the United States and Brazil sit at the same table. Brazil is an influential nation, and it's an important nation. And I really do appreciate so very much your—sharing your strategic thoughts about not only our own neighborhood but other parts of the world.

And so, Mr. President, it's with great pleasure that I welcome you here. I'm looking forward to giving you a tour of Camp David. We've been spending too much time doing business; now we need to do a little pleasure. And after this press conference, you and I will take a little tour, and then I'll feed you a meal, if you're hungry. *[Laughter]*

Welcome.

President Lula da Silva. I hope that it's not too much work. *[Laughter]* Your Excellency, Mr. George W. Bush, the President of the United States; Madam First Lady Laura Bush; Madam Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice; Ambassador Celso Amorim, and other ministers from Brazil; ladies and gentlemen; members of the Brazilian delegation and the U.S. delegation; newspaper representatives, press representatives: First of all, I would like to thank President Bush for the invitation. My visit to Camp David made it possible for us to cope with issues of global, regional, and bilateral interest.

I believe that on—the 21st century will be marked by changes that we will have to do—to undertake, and also for the improvement of the things that we did right in the 20th century. We don't have anymore the cold war amongst us. We don't experience anymore the bipolarity that affected our lives during half a century. And so now we should try to do in the 21st century—make it the century of inclusion of those that are disenfranchised in the 20th century—

disenfranchised. And I am talking about the less developed countries in Latin America, of South America, of Africa, and of Asia.

And we also have a subject matter that we have to cope in the 21st century that we did not cope well in the 20th century, and that could pervade our relations for the next years. That is the issue on climate change that affects the planet Earth. Twenty years ago, when we were warned about the problems that we were causing to the world, we used to call—put the blame on those that were making this warning. We criticized them. We said that they were responsible. And we criticized, sometimes, minority groups that went to the streets with their banners and flags, advocating for environmental preservation.

Now has come the time for all the countries in the world to take very seriously climate change and environmental issues. Why so? Because humanity faces one of the major risks in its history. Global warming is a reality that threatens us by land, by the air, and by the water, a dilemma that ironically embraces all of us, no matter where in the planet Earth. The issue is frightening and very concrete and a problem of today. But its solution is still feasible, and part of the solution is in our reach.

We have talked already about this twice. We have talked about biofuels and about our determination in deepening the cooperation in this sector. The memorandum of understanding that was signed in Sao Paulo is the basis of an ambitious partnership that will make it possible for us to confront the major challenges of this century that is now beginning: First of all, the resolution of the energy crisis that affects almost all countries in the world; secondly, the environment protection threatened by the global warming of the planet; and finally, poverty relief and social exclusion with the creation of new jobs and expanding the workers' income and for the poorest workers in the world.

We intend to send our scientists and experts from Brazil to research centers in the U.S. and vice versa. We will create a fund with the support of international agencies, so that we can finance the cooperation with the most needy and interest—countries. We're also committed to the strengthening of the

International Biofuel Forum. I invited the United States to participate in an international conference on the issue that Brazil will host in the year 2008.

The concern with the environment is growing in Brazil and in the world and, above all, especially after the latest reports from the U.N. panel on climate change. The stimuli for sustainable production of biofuels is a decisive part of this endeavor to resolve this issue. The biofuels offer, equally, an unique opportunity for the energy democratization of the world to diversify sources of production. We also have obtained good results in different, various areas.

It's important to say to President Bush, here in Camp David, in his residence, that, for me, the biofuel issue is almost like an obsession. I don't know why, but we already have talked about—or heard about biofuels since 1925. Already was mentioned biodiesel in 1943 in Brazil. Nevertheless, since we didn't have the dimension, the scope of the evils that oil could cause, or any other kind of energy matrix to the world—because also, oil was very cheap in those days—this was not taken forward by any country, neither by the automobile industry of any country. And now we are facing a period, a moment, where this new energy matrix can make the world more independent.

It can make the world creating more wealth, because the experience that we have in Brazil is that for each worker that works in a biodiesel plant, it is necessary 1,000 workers in the countryside, which means that we can create millions of jobs for the less developed countries in the world. That was not foreseen in any paper that was signed by us in the 20th century.

In Brazil, in the last 4 years, we managed to reduce the deforestation of the Amazon rainforest in 52 percent. More than 2 million hectares have been saved. Please pay attention—more than—and carbon gas emissions have been reduced in more than 400 tons, emissions to the atmosphere. And we know that the rainforests are amongst the great victims of climate change. In the negotiations on the Convention on Climate Change, we proposed financial incentives to reduce carbon gas emissions per ton, resulting in further reductions of deforestation. We expect

that our proposal would have the support of the international community and, obviously, especially, and mainly from the U.S.

We first can establish a partnership either for promoting biofuels, as also in fighting the investigation of the global warming and of deforestation itself, with full respect to the sovereignty of each country.

Brazil has the largest and most important biodiversity on the planet. We have the consciousness of the value that this natural asset represents for our country and for the world. Brazil, with 383 million hectares of arable land, has the capacity to reconcile food production, biofuel production, and the defense of our forests.

Our well-known commitment to fight hunger does not allow us that any activity would cause damage to the food production. I should say—and President Bush knows very well, and I also know—and I believe that all rulers are aware that the world hunger does not result from a lack of food. Rather, it has more to do with the distribution of income and the lack of political will.

Talking with President Bush about the concern of my Government to fight hunger and poverty, I mentioned our concern with the Doha round of the WTO. It is central in our struggle against poverty. And I leave Camp David with the certainty that I've never seen. In all the previous conversations that I had with President Bush or with my Minister of Foreign Affairs—with Condoleezza—Madam Condoleezza Rice, I never have left a meeting between us with so much optimism as I am this way, that I believe that we're getting closer than we have ever been before to reach an agreement during the Doha round of the WTO.

We are trying to conclude with success these trade negotiations. We have urgency in reach and ambitious and balanced agreements. The continuation of agriculture subsidies makes food more expensive and does not stimulate its production in the less developed countries. Without eliminating subsidies, the opportunity of development represented by biofuels will be lost and, with that, the possibility of the improvement of living conditions of hundreds of millions of lives of men and women.

So that's why it's necessary to eliminate the trade barriers to ethanol, so that we can really reach a true energy commodity. I dream that, at the most, 15 to 20 years from now that the world will surrender to the biofuels. So those that believe in that, they start to invest today and now, because if they leave it for the future, they're going to lag behind and they're going to lose the train and, possibly, they will be lagging behind in the history of modernization.

Dear friends, naturally, I have spoken with President Bush about the Brazilian concern on the limited progress of the U.N. reform. This is where we have more divergence. But in politics, if there's no divergence, if it's not interesting to work with politics, to being politics, but I really wanted, truly, to say to President Bush what was Brazil's view. And President Bush told me what his vision was.

And we reached a conclusion, and certainly, it's not an agreement yet, that the U.N. reform still will have to undertake other reforms that we have to undertake within the U.N. itself so that we can guarantee the U.N. Security Council reform. Since I only have 61 years of age and I have another 4 years of my term, I am convinced that it won't take a long time for us to see this Council changed and the U.N. reformed. I know that it is a highly complex issue, but we cannot postpone it anymore. I am certain that the dialog between our countries will contribute to forward the issue in a much more faster and appropriated way.

We also talked about other issues on the international agenda, as the situation in the Middle East, especially in Lebanon. And maybe many of you don't know—and I told President Bush that—that in Brazil, we have a community of more than 10 million inhabitants of Lebanese and Syrian ancestry. And so that's why we have been trying to attend all the fora that deal with this issue. And within our possibilities, we try to cooperate to rebuild Lebanon. We also have tried to help the construction of a viable Palestinian state while, at the same time, respect Israel's right to exist.

Ladies and gentlemen, we approached important issues in our regional agenda, and I told to President Bush that we have to do more for Haiti. And, in this case, it's inter-

esting to remember that we have reached already agreements not only to work together with Haiti and in Haiti and work together with the Dominican Republic, and work together in countries like Sao Tome and Principe in Africa and in Guinea-Bissau in Africa. And if these experiments are successful, these joint partnerships, this joint work, I believe that we'll have much more room for us to build other projects between the U.S. and Brazil, so that we can help third party countries.

We also agreed that the cooperation with biofuels in Haiti could be decisive to that country. It's not suffice to be the armed forces from Brazil, Chile, Argentina in Haiti, leading the stabilization mission of the U.N. We need to guarantee democracy in Haiti, governance. It's necessary to guarantee their security. But if we don't have development and jobs, all of that will disappear very quickly.

I also told President Bush that Brazil invests firmly in South American integration. I should say, President Bush, this is another thing that I pursued since the first year of my term. If we want to guarantee democracy in South America, if we want to guarantee South American development, if we want to guarantee the strengthening of the institutions in South America, we have to have the consciousness that fiscal integration is a basic addition for the development of the region. And maybe, who knows, the United States can be a partner of Brazil and of other countries in South America in the fiscal integration that we so much are in need. And we understand that this is what will guarantee development for the region and will guarantee democracy, and so will open the opportunities that we did not have years ago for us to develop ourselves.

We are obtaining extraordinary advances vis-a-vis integration, expanding trade, and making all the infrastructure work that we can develop. The bottom line is that we're getting closer ties to our people that were very much far away from each other in the past. And so now we're getting closer, and so that's why I invited President Bush from the U.S. to become a partner in this integration process and building the fiscal integration of our continent.

I also mentioned to President Bush an important role that the United States can play with South American countries that are living in special situations, especially those that need trade preferences. It is extremely important for the U.S. to support these countries that need these trade preferences. We need to support them because this will guarantee the regional stability that is the interest of—to Brazil and all the countries in South America, and certainly, this is the interest of the U.S. too.

Together we can provide aid to those countries that are still needy, especially in Africa. I have already mentioned the agreement that we signed with Guinea-Bissau and for Sao Tome and Principe.

The challenge, President Bush, in the world of today in trade, in security, in the environment, and fighting poverty are immense. To resolve these issues, there is only one way—is through dialog, with a frank and mutually respectful dialog. That's the only way. With this objective, I have been saying to President Bush that I am willing to gather with him as many times it's necessary, and with all the heads of government around the world as many times would be necessary, so that we can, in the 21st century, arouse a little bit of hope in part of the poorest population in the planet. We have in our hands and our reach the power to do so. We will not do it if we don't wish to do so.

So that's why, before we answer questions from the press with President Bush, I would like to convey to President Bush that, of all the meetings that I participated, meetings with the American Government, this was the meeting that was the most productive one. If someone asked me, "What are you taking back to Brazil," I would say, "Nothing. I'm not taking back anything to Brazil." But certainly, the agreements that we have signed today, the agreements that we can still sign from here onwards, can guarantee in a definite way that the relations between U.S. and Brazil, not only it's necessary, but it is strategic so that we can consolidate a new development model, a new trade policy, and, above all, a new way to cope with the very serious, severe issues that affect the planet.

So, for all that, thank you very much.

Department of Justice

Q. Mr. President, the Attorney General's chief of staff testified that Gonzales knew more about the U.S. attorney firings than he let on. Now, how can the American people have confidence in an Attorney General who is not completely forthright? How long does he have to repair the damage, and can the damage be repaired?

President Bush. Attorney General Al Gonzales is an honorable and honest man, and he has my full confidence. He is providing documents for Congress to find the truth. He will testify in front of Congress, and he will tell the truth.

The U.S. attorneys serve at the pleasure of the United States President. I named them to 4-year terms; they served their 4-year terms. And I appreciate their service. I'm sorry that this—these hearings and all this stuff have besmirched their reputation. That's certainly not the intent of anybody in this administration. But I will remind you, there is no credible evidence that there has been any wrongdoing.

Trade

Q. The good will between you gentlemen is very evident. President Lula, it is also evident the effort to advance with the Doha round. If the Doha round has not reached its success, Brazil, does it have a B plan?

President Bush, what is the impediment—or what would be the impediment for the United States to have a bilateral agreement on trade with Brazil?

President Lula da Silva. Well, I have said to all the heads of state in government that I have been in contact and on—to President Bush, to Tony Blair, and to Chancellor Angela Merkel, to Prodi, Prime Minister Prodi, and to President Chirac—with all I have been talking to, I have said that the Doha round is not important only for Brazil; it's not important only for the United States; it's important so that we can guarantee hope around the world, and especially the certainty that we will have more peace in the world.

Brazil is a competitive country in agriculture. Brazil, today, exports—50 percent of its exports are semi-industrialized goods. And

so we do have the conditions—competitive-ness conditions. President Bush knows and I know and I believe that all the leaders know that when we talk about agreements at the WTO, we are making an endeavor at the Doha round—we are working especially so that the less developed countries could have an opportunity, a chance. Of course, we can improve our relations when Brazil makes decisions about industrialized products or in the service industry. Of course, we could improve when the United States takes a position about what kind of subsidy will be reduced, or the European Union could say if they're going to accept or not agricultural goods—reduce the subsidy so that the markets of the less developed countries could have market access to Europe.

If we don't reach an agreement, Brazil will continue to follow the path that it's followed: working, producing more, and selling and also buying. But certainly, those that will suffer more will be those don't—that don't even have the opportunity to participate in the meetings that other countries have the power to do so.

I have made these appeals, and I believe that that's why I said, to leaving here, Camp David, I'm leaving here very satisfied because this was an extraordinary and productive meeting, because I heard from—the intention of the American Government on this issue. Our is—we have full willingness, and I believe that if we work together, the U.S. and Brazil, to try to convince our European partners, I believe that we can reach an agreement.

And I believe that, in this case, there's no B plan. Either we have the A plan, or there's no agreement. And if there's no agreement, certainly, we will not have winners or losers—everybody will lose. Everybody will lose—the rich, because they will be liable for what will happen in a poorest world.

President Bush. All our trade discussions have centered on completing Doha. It's the only discussions I've had with the President. I've been asked about plan B's before, on different subjects. And that kind of means you're willing to retreat. I'm a plan-A man, just like the President is. Let's get the job done.

And for the United States, we're willing to reduce our agricultural subsidies in a substantial way. We understand. On the other hand, we expect our goods and services—whether they be agricultural goods or manufactured goods and services—to be given access to markets. The interesting thing is, is that Brazil is a strong exporter, and it's in Brazil's interest that their goods and services be—have access to markets as well.

This is a difficult negotiations because there's a variety of interests. And step one is—to be successful in this complex negotiations, is there a genuine desire to succeed? In other words, are people just showing up for the sake of showing up, or are people actually coming to the table with a genuine desire to succeed? I assured the President again that the United States has a genuine desire to succeed in these talks. I do, because I believe that, one, I think the world has a tendency, at times, to become isolationist and protectionist. In other words, there's that movement, that isolationist movement can become prevalent. And if that were to happen, it would make the world a lot more unstable and it would make the world more poor.

I'm going to repeat what I told you earlier: Ours is a very compassionate nation. We deeply care about the human condition around the world. And I firmly believe that the best way to alleviate world poverty is through trade. That's what I believe. It's not the only way, but it is the best start—let me put it to you that way—coupled with health initiatives that we're working on, food initiatives that the President described. But if you're genuinely interested in eliminating poverty—and I am—commerce, trade, opportunity, and hope will all flourish with a completion of the Doha round.

So we are seriously involved. Now, what we won't do is accept a unilateral deal. And the President has never asked us to do that; that's not his intention. His intention is, we want to work together to make sure all are treated fairly. I certainly hope that's the case with the rest of our potential trading partners and our negotiating partners, that they don't expect the United States to carry the entire load in making sure the agreement moves forward.

And so we strategized together. Our—the ministers will talk a lot. Ambassador Schwab stayed behind in Sao Paulo to converse with her counterparts. There is a lot of work going on. And I believe there's a good chance we can complete the round. And so therefore, your plan B will be irrelevant—[laughter]—I hope.

Environment/British Military Personnel Held in Iran

Q. Jennifer Griffin of FOX News. Mr. President, the Iranian hostage crisis has just entered its ninth day—past its ninth day. Would the British be within their rights to consider a military option if the crisis drags on? And would the U.S. have considered it an act of war if it had been U.S. sailors and marines who had been taken? And would you consider trading the five Iranians who were captured in Irbil back in January if it would help resolve the crisis?

And, Mr. President, did you see eye to eye with the President on global warming? Would you say that you two agree that global warming is a problem? Thank you.

President Bush. Let me start with global warming. One reason you promote alternative fuels is to be better stewards of the environment. Many of the greenhouse gases come from tailpipes of automobiles. And therefore, when you get away from gasoline and start using ethanol or biofuels, you make a significant step toward improving the environment—just to make sure I'm on the record here.

The Iranian issue is a serious issue. It's serious because—or the British hostages issue is a serious issue because the Iranians took these people out of Iraqi water. And it's inexcusable behavior. And I strongly support the Blair Government's attempts to resolve this peacefully, and I support the Prime Minister when he made it clear there were no quid pro quos. The Iranians must give back the hostages. They're innocent; they were doing nothing wrong; and they were summarily plucked out of water. And it is—as I say, it's inexcusable behavior.

President Lula da Silva. Well, I believe that we are in agreement in relationship to the policies that we have to undertake so that we should be more careful and take better

care of the environment. And on the climate change issues discussions, we have common interests. What happens is that—to know the timing and what to do. Now, in the case of Brazil, we already have 25 percent of ethanol—or better saying, 23 percent of ethanol blended, or as a blender, in gasoline for a long time. And now we have a flex-fuel engine, a car moved by flex-fuel engine that can use 100 percent of gas or 100 percent of ethanol or 50 percent of alcohol, 50 percent of ethanol as blender.

So this is the road that—where we can start to depollute. And then it's not only the ethanol issue or the biofuel issue; there is also the electrical hydro powerplants. We also have to have the responsibility on us to build thermal plants based on coke, moved by coke—moved by coal, I'm sorry. And so it's essential that the company should invest more in reducing gas emissions.

So the fact of the matter is the following: That the climate change issue today is a severe disease. There's no social sector that it doesn't reach. It will reach all the planet as a whole. There's no way for us to escape. So we have not managed yet to reach Mars, and Moon is not a proper place for us to live. So either we take care of planet Earth very carefully, as we take care of our sons, or all of us will regret that in the future. And although, those already my age—I'm with 61 years of age, but I have grandsons, and I want to have grand-grandsons, and so I want them to have the pride that their grandfather helped to build a better world, better than I received from my father.

So I believe that all of us will reach an agreement, that it's necessary and very much so the responsibility and liability, in the discussions on climate issues than we have had up until today. The evil is facing us, and we see the evil, and we feel the evil, but there's no way that we can turn our back to that.

Iran

Q. The American Government, last week, have manifested a lot of concern with the investments of some foreign companies in the oil industry in Iran. And in this week, the American Ambassador in Brazil made it very clear that this concern also extends to

Petrobras investments that Petrobras considers strategic. So I'd like to ask President Lula if, in his assessment, Petrobras should continue to make businesses with Iran or should get away from Iran, like the United States would like us all to do?

So—and I would like to ask President Bush, why does the United States want Petrobras to be out of Iran if the country has fulfilled all its sanctions that was approved—passed by the U.N.?

President Lula da Silva. Well, I am convinced that Petrobras will continue to invest in oil prospection in Iran. Iran has been an important trade partner for Brazil. They buy from us more than \$1 billion, and they don't almost sell anything to us. So I'm an advocate that trade, fair trade is the trade that you buy and sell—you sell and buy. You can't just sell.

And then there's also political issues in each country. Each country faces their own domestic issues. But up until now, Iran has not been a victim of any sanction that was proposed by the U.N. I know that there's political divergence on this between Iran and other countries, but with Brazil, we have no political divergence with them, so we will continue to work together with Iran on what is of the interest of Brazil. I don't see any major issue to do it in a different way.

President Bush. Every nation makes the decisions that they think is best in their interest. Brazil is a sovereign nation; he just articulated a sovereign decision. And as you mentioned, the trade that you were discussing was not in violation of any U.N.—in any U.N. mandate.

Our position is that we would hope that nations would be very careful in dealing with Iran, particularly since Iran is trying to develop a nuclear weapon, and a major threat to world peace is if the Iranians had a nuclear weapon. And that is why there are sanctions imposed at the United Nations, as a result of collaboration between the United States, EU, China, and Russia, to make it clear to the Iranian regime that there is a better way forward other than isolation.

We have no problems with the Iranian people. As a matter of fact, the United States highly respects the people of Iran. We respect the history of Iran; we respect the rich

traditions of Iran. We, however, are deeply concerned about an Iranian Government that is in violation of international accords in their attempt to develop a nuclear weapon. And therefore, whatever comments you hear reflect that concern. And we will continue to work with the international community to say that it is in the world's interest that Iran not develop a weapon. It is in the interest of peace that they not develop a weapon.

And I'm hopeful that the people of Iran will be tired of the isolation. I would hope that there would be some rationality amongst their leaders in choosing a better way forward for the people. They're depriving their people of a lot of opportunity.

Now, having said that, the United States does believe that it's in our interest that we have people-to-people exchanges. As I say, we have no problem with the Iranian people. As a matter of fact, we just sent a wrestling team to Iran, all attempting to make it clear to the Iranian people that we're interested in having a constructive relationship. And it is the decisions of their Government that are preventing that from happening.

Thank you. Good job.

NOTE: The President's news conference began at 4:20 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Ambassador Susan C. Schwab, U.S. Trade Representative; and Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom. President Lula da Silva referred to Minister of External Relations Celso Amorim of Brazil; Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany; Prime Minister Romano Prodi of Italy; and President Jacques Chirac of France. Reporters referred to former Chief of Staff to the Attorney General D. Kyle Sampson; and U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Clifford M. Sobel. President Lula da Silva and some reporters spoke in Portuguese, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Joint Statement on the Occasion of the Visit by President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva of Brazil to Camp David

March 31, 2007

Presidents Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva and George W. Bush resolved to continue deepening the strategic dialogue between Brazil and the United States, as reflected in the determination to increase bilateral cooperation

based on the shared values of democracy, human rights, cultural diversity, trade liberalization, multilateralism, environmental protection, defense of international peace and security, and promotion of development with social justice.

The Presidents welcomed the strengthening of the partnership between the two countries in the area of renewable energy with the Memorandum of Understanding to Advance Cooperation on Biofuels, signed in Sao Paulo on March 9, 2007. The Presidents noted with satisfaction the results of the meeting on implementation of the Memorandum, held in Washington on March 29. They expressed their governments' intention to arrange for Brazilian scientists and researchers to visit state-of-the-art biofuels research laboratories in the United States, as well as visits to Brazil by senior officials of the United States Departments of Energy, State, and Agriculture in Spring 2007. The United States and Brazil recognized the support of institutions including the IDB, the United Nations Foundation, and the Organization of American States. Brazil and the United States plan to begin efforts to work together, initially, with Haiti, the Dominican Republic, St. Kitts and Nevis, and El Salvador, and to pursue consultations with other countries interested in participating in the cooperation program.

The Presidents noted with satisfaction the growth of bilateral trade and investments between the United States and Brazil. They reaffirmed their intention to use the ongoing "Commercial Dialogue" to seek ways to promote innovation and increase trade opportunities, particularly for small- and medium-sized enterprises, as well as to protect intellectual property rights. The Heads of State noted the formation of the U.S.-Brazil CEO Forum to engage directly with leaders in the business community to discuss economic and trade-related topics. They applauded plans by United States Council on Competitiveness and Brazilian Competitiveness Movement to stage an "Innovation Summit" in Brasilia in July 2007 to support greater competitiveness and innovation. The Presidents agreed to direct their governments to explore initiatives in the area of tourism, including examining the possibility of increasing flights between

Brazil and the United States, with particular attention to Northeast Brazil.

The Presidents applauded the March 20, 2007 signing in Brasilia of an Agreement for the Exchange of Information Relating to Taxes. The Presidents expressed hope that the signing of this Agreement will be the first step toward cooperation between the Brazilian Federal Revenue Secretariat and the Internal Revenue Service. They pledged to redouble ongoing work toward the conclusion of an agreement on double taxation.

The Presidents noted with satisfaction the progress achieved since their November 2005 meeting in Brasilia, including the first-ever convening of the bilateral Joint Commission on Science and Technology on July 21, 2006; and the launch of a Commercial Dialogue between the Brazilian Ministry of Development, Industry, and Foreign Trade and the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The Presidents welcomed the strengthened partnership in education through the renewal of the Memorandum of Understanding in this area. They applauded the immediate start-up of its implementation with the launch of a program targeting increased professional and technological education in Brazil and bilateral exchange in an effort to include increasing numbers of young people and adults in the labor market.

The Presidents expressed their support for cooperation with African countries. They applauded the trilateral cooperation to strengthen the Legislative Branch of Guinea-Bissau, as established in the March 30 Memorandum of Understanding. The Presidents also discussed the possible broadening of such cooperative efforts to include other interested African countries. The two Presidents announced a specific commitment to cooperate on a plan to eradicate malaria in Sao Tome and Principe. They also agreed to explore cooperation in combating malaria, tuberculosis, and neglected diseases, especially in Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa such as Angola and Mozambique, and to confront the threat of avian flu, building on their cooperation on HIV/AIDS in Mozambique and Angola.

The Presidents recognized that the success of international action in Haiti depends on simultaneous activities to achieve security,

political reconciliation, and socioeconomic development. They intend to act within the United Nations framework to increase multilateral cooperation in Haiti and welcomed efforts to identify areas of mutual cooperation in support of stability and economic development in Cite Soleil. They applauded the success of efforts by Brazil and the United States, in cooperation with other countries in the region, to secure United Nations Security Council renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) last February.

The Presidents sought to strengthen bilateral cooperation in the area of public safety, particularly in combating organized crime, drug trafficking, and money laundering, and in preventing terrorism and terrorism financing, with emphasis on information sharing between intelligence units and on the establishment of mechanisms for recovering assets resulting from transnational crimes.

The Heads of State reaffirmed global economic growth and development as the main objectives of the Doha Round of the World Trade Organization (WTO). They underscored the importance of continuing to constructively engage negotiators, which facilitated the resumption of the negotiations. The Presidents pledged to work together toward a successful conclusion, taking advantage of the window of opportunity opened in 2007. They emphasized that the agreement should be ambitious and balanced, with a view to both an appreciable increase in market access and in global trade flows, and a significant reduction in global poverty rates.

The Presidents reaffirmed the importance of reform of the United Nations to make the organization better able to deal with today's complex international agenda. They further reaffirmed their commitment to coordinate closely on the issue of Security Council reform.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this joint statement.

Notice—Notice of Intention To Enter Into a Free Trade Agreement With Korea

April 1, 2007

Consistent with section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Trade Act of 2002, I have notified the Congress of my intention to enter into a free trade agreement with the Republic of Korea.

Consistent with section 2105(a)(1)(A) of that Act, this notice shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

George W. Bush

The White House,
April 1, 2007.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:57 a.m., April 2, 2007]

NOTE: This notice was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 2, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 3.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Notice of Intention To Enter Into a Free Trade Agreement With Korea

April 1, 2007

Dear Madam Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Consistent with section 2105(a)(1)(A) of the Trade Act of 2002, (Public Law 107–210; the “Trade Act”), I am pleased to notify the Congress of my intention to enter into a free trade agreement with the Republic of Korea.

The United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement (the “Agreement”) will generate export opportunities for U.S. farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and service suppliers, promote economic growth and the creation of better paying jobs in the United States, and help American consumers save money while offering them greater choices. The Agreement will also further enhance the strong United States-Korea partnership, which has served as a force for stability and prosperity in Asia.

Consistent with the Trade Act, I am sending this notification at least 90 days in advance of signing the Agreement. My Administration looks forward to working with the

Congress in developing appropriate legislation to approve and implement this Agreement.

Sincerely,

George W. Bush

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Richard B. Cheney, President of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 2.

Remarks Following a Meeting on Health Savings Accounts

April 2, 2007

The cornerstone of good health care policy is to make sure that patients and docs are in charge of medical decisions. And therefore, one of the objectives of this administration has been to encourage the expansion of products like health savings accounts. And today I have met with some small-business owners, some employees of companies that have provided health savings accounts for them.

And I'm pleased to report that people have come to realize the benefits of health savings accounts, such as, one, health savings accounts are affordable for individuals and small businesses. In other words, if you're a small-business owner and you're worried about providing good health care for your employees, you ought to look into a health savings account as a way to provide that benefit to your employees.

Secondly, health savings accounts enable a person to save, tax-free, for medical expenses. By making rational decisions about your life, you'll end up with more money in your health savings account, on a tax-free basis.

And thirdly, that savings account is something you can carry with you from job to job. A lot of people in America change jobs on a regular basis, and they are deeply concerned about whether or not they'll have a health care plan when they change jobs. And the health savings account enables you to carry your money that you've saved, on a tax-free basis, from one job to the next.

You know, 2 years ago there was—about a million of our citizens had health savings

accounts. And today, over 5 million of people have health savings accounts—or nearly 5 million people have health savings accounts. It's up—actually, you can see from the chart the growth—4.5 million people. And that's a 43-percent increase, from last year to this year, in the number of people that are beginning to realize the benefits of health savings accounts.

And interestingly enough, of those who purchased—of individuals who purchased health savings accounts, about 25 percent of them were uninsured. In other words, health savings accounts enable someone who is uninsured to realize the benefits of private insurance, and in an affordable way.

I strongly believe that the United States Congress needs to strengthen health savings accounts, just like they need to make sure that the Tax Code treats every person in America fairly. And that's why I've suggested we change the Tax Code to enable the small-business owner, the self-employed, or the individual worker to be able to have more affordable insurance. There's a lot we can do together to empower the individual in this country to be in charge of his or her health care decisions.

So I want to thank my fellow Americans for joining us. I really appreciated the discussion we had. We've got people from Minnesota and Texas and Georgia and Michigan. These are people who are beginning to realize the benefits of health savings, and I thank you for sharing your information with me. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:24 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of these remarks.

Remarks on Presenting the Commander in Chief's Trophy to the United States Naval Academy Midshipmen

April 2, 2007

The President. Please be seated. Welcome to the Rose Garden. It seems to me that this is becoming a spring tradition. [Laughter] For the fourth year in a row, the football team from the Naval Academy is

here to receive the Commander in Chief's Trophy—the Rose Garden should be called the “Yard.”

This year's team was among the Navy's best ever. That says a lot. This is a team that had the most rushing yards in the Nation. That says a lot. You had the highest graduation rate of any football team in the country. That says even more. You went 9 and 3. You made it to the bowl game. And you beat Army.

I thank you all for coming. I appreciate members of the administration who have joined us: Deputy Secretary of the VA Gordon Mansfield; Secretary Don Winter of the Navy; General Pete Pace, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and, I might add, the first marine to serve in that capacity; Admiral G, Ed Giambastiani—that's hard for a Texan to say, but it's not hard to tell you how much I admire Admiral G and Pete Pace; Admiral Mike Mullen, Chief of Naval Operations, thank you for coming, Chief; General Jim Conway, Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Ellen Moyer, the mayor of Annapolis. We are glad you all are here, and Mayor, thanks for coming.

Vice Admiral Rod Rempt—Rod, I notice that you gathered up my speech. *[Laughter]* Just remember, page three follows page two. *[Laughter]* But it's good to have you again.

Vice Adm. Rodney P. Rempt. Sir, it's a pleasure to be here.

The President. Coach Paul Johnson—you talk about a winner, this guy knows how to build winners. And, Coach, we're glad you're back. I'm proud to welcome you and your staff. I appreciate very much the members of the football team that have joined us, and I thank all of the Naval Academy supporters who are here.

The Navy's fourth consecutive winning season may not sound like much to people who don't follow football, but it's a remarkable feat considering that the team was 0 and 10, 6 years ago. They showed up 10 times; they played hard all 10 times; but they won 0 times. And here they are, standing in the Rose Garden with the Commander in Chief. It says a lot about resilience and a lot about determination and a lot about correcting past mistakes.

Coach Johnson has put together a really good coaching staff, and I appreciate very much, Coach, you motivating these players toward championship—toward the championships that you've earned. The season started with three wins in a row, including a blowout over Stanford. You beat Air Force in Colorado Springs. You beat Army by 12 points, the fifth win in a row for the Naval Academy. They tell me that's a pretty big deal.

You earned a spot in the Meineke Car Care Bowl—Meineke Car Care Bowl. Nevertheless, you played a big-time school: Boston College. Boston College is a football power, and it was a really great game. I watched it. I was impressed by the 322 yards you earned. I know you're disappointed with the one-point loss, but you can't be disappointed with the effort.

I appreciate the fact that your class is the first in school history to win four straight Commander in Chief trophies, the first to go 8 and 0 against Army and Air Force, and the first to play in four straight bowl games. That's a lot of firsts. Your class won 35 games in 4 years. The only Navy class to win more games graduated in 1909. I don't know whether William Howard Taft welcomed the team in 1909, but I can tell you, the 43d President is proud to welcome such champions here to the Rose Garden.

One of the reasons your team was so successful this year, of course, is because you had a captain from Texas. *[Laughter]* Five different Navy players rushed for more than 100 yards in a game this season. That's more than any other team in the Nation. That's called a well-balanced attack.

I appreciate the fact that one of your quarterbacks stepped in for an injured starter and went on to score four touchdowns in a single game. I would like to say his name; I'll probably bungle it. I'll just say, the guy is from Hawaii. *[Laughter]*

I appreciate the fact that Keenan Little became the first player in Navy history to score defensive touchdowns against Air Force and Army in the same season. I'm proud to be up here with a fellow Texan from Lewisville, Texas—the mascot of one of the high school teams in Lewisville, believe it or not, is the “Fighting Farmers.” *[Laughter]* This guy was

your fullback, Adam Ballard. He gained 134 yards against Air Force. When he was named MVP, he wisely—wisely—gave the credit to his offensive line. Smart move, Adam. [Laughter]

You know, it's interesting—how would you like to be the punter on the Navy team who went full—two full games without showing up on the field? [Laughter] Veteto—Greg is his first name—was, like, the punter on the team, and for two games in a row, he was never used. And yet I think he didn't mind.

The team had a special leader in Eddie Martin. I don't know if the country knows this, but he was diagnosed with cancer last year. He didn't play any games this year, but he always led the team out of the locker room for every home game. And so, Eddie, I appreciate the inspiration you've provided for your team and for the Academy. I know you're fighting a brave battle, and a lot of people will pray for your full recovery.

When you signed up for the Naval Academy, you signed up for more than playing football. I'm glad Coach Johnson—I'm sure Coach Johnson was glad that you said, "I want to be a football player at the Naval Academy." But you signed up to become officers in the finest military the world has ever known. And my job is to keep it that way, and I will. But you can't have the finest military the world has ever known without men and women who volunteer to wear the uniform, just like you've done.

You volunteered after September the 11th, 2001. That's a remarkable decision you have made. I vowed after September 11th, 2001, that I would use the full power of our Government to protect the American people from harm, and I meant what I said. And therefore, anybody who signed up afterwards knew what they were getting into. It's a remarkable country when people make such a noble decision to serve their country in a time of war. And I'm proud to be the Commander in Chief of such decent, honorable, sacrificing men and women.

The lessons you have learned on the football field and at the Naval Academy will serve you well on the battlefield. You learned the importance of teamwork and leadership and strong personal character. And you're going to put those qualities to the highest possible

use, and that is to protect the American people and to lay the foundation of peace for generations to come.

The Navy and Marine Corps are on the frontline of fighting and winning the war against the extremists, radicals who would do this country harm. Every day we're on the offense against an enemy. My attitude is, I would rather defeat them over there so we do not have to face them here. And the Marine Corps and the Navy are helping to lead that charge. The sailors and marines on the high sea are sending a clear message to the world that we stand for strength, and we stand for peace.

Former Navy football players have distinguished themselves in the line of duty. Marine First Lieutenant Brian Stann comes to mind, the class of '03. He won the Silver Star. We also have some of the former Navy football players lose their lives: Ron Winchester of '01; J.P. Blecksmith of the class of '03; another gave his life in flight over the Pacific, Navy Lieutenant Commander Scott Zelle, the class of '91. The United States of America will not forget their sacrifices. We will complete our missions so that their sacrifices will not have gone in vain.

It is such an honor to welcome such fine men to the Rose Garden. I'm proud to be standing with you. I thank you for your service to our country. I appreciate the fact that you're good football players. But, more importantly, I appreciate the fact that you're good Americans.

God bless.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:35 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Vice Adm. Rodney P. Rempt, USN, superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy; and Kaiponoa Keheaku-Enhada, quarterback, Kennan Little, strong safety, and Eddie Martin, running back, U.S. Naval Academy football team.

Message on the Observance of Passover, 5767

April 2, 2007

*This day shall be for you a memorial day,
and you shall keep it as a feast to the Lord;*

throughout your generations, as a statute forever, you shall keep it as a feast.

Exodus 12:14

I send greetings to those celebrating Passover, beginning at sundown on April 2.

During Passover, Jews around the world gather with family and friends to remember God's deliverance of the Children of Israel from bondage more than 3,000 years ago. To celebrate their Exodus from Egypt, the Jewish people commemorate the Passover each year by reading the Haggadah, singing traditional songs, and sharing the Seder meal. Through these traditions, the Jewish people express their gratitude for God's redemption and the blessings of freedom, and they ensure that their heritage is passed on to future generations. Passover is a time of hope and faith and a time to reflect on God's boundless love and endless mercy.

Laura and I send our best wishes for a blessed Passover.

George W. Bush

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Executive Order 13428—Renaming a National Forest in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

April 2, 2007

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1897 (16 U.S.C. 473) and section 1 of the Act of July 1, 1902 (48 U.S.C. 746), and to rename the Caribbean National Forest in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Caribbean National Forest in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is hereby renamed the "El Yunque National Forest."

Sec. 2. Previous references to the Caribbean National Forest in Executive Order 7059-A of June 4, 1935, and Executive Order 10992 of February 9, 1962, shall, for all purposes hereafter, be deemed references to the "El Yunque National Forest."

Sec. 3. This order shall be implemented in accordance with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations.

Sec. 4. This order is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the United States, agencies, entities, officers, employees, or agents thereof, or any other person.

George W. Bush

The White House,
April 2, 2007.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:50 a.m., April 3, 2007]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on April 4.

The President's News Conference

April 3, 2007

The President. Good morning. I've just had a good meeting with Secretary of Defense Bob Gates and General Pete Pace, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Secretary Gates and General Pace updated me on the deployment of American reinforcements to Iraq.

At this moment, two of the five additional U.S. Army brigades we are sending for this mission are operating in Baghdad. A third brigade is now moving from Kuwait and will be fully operational in Baghdad in the coming weeks. And the remaining two brigades will deploy in April and May. It will be early June before all U.S. forces dedicated to the operation are in place, so this operation is still in its beginning stages.

The reinforcements we've sent to Baghdad are having a impact. They're making a difference. And as more of those reinforcements arrive in the months ahead, their impact will continue to grow. But to succeed in their mission, our troops need Congress to provide the resources, funds, and equipment they need to fight our enemies.

It has now been 57 days since I requested that Congress pass emergency funds for our troops. Instead of passing clean bills that fund our troops on the frontlines, the House and Senate have spent this time debating bills that undercut the troops by substituting

the judgment of politicians in Washington for the judgment of our commanders on the ground, setting an arbitrary deadline for withdrawal from Iraq, and spending billions of dollars on porkbarrel projects completely unrelated to the war.

I made it clear for weeks that if either the House or Senate version of this bill comes to my desk, I will veto it. And it is also clear from the strong support for this position in both Houses that the veto would be sustained. The only way the Democrats were able to pass their bill in the first place was to load the bill with pork and other spending that has nothing to do with the war.

Here's what one leading Democrat in the House said, quote, "A lot of things had to go into that bill that certainly those of us who respect great legislation did not want there." That's an honest appraisal of the process that we just witnessed. Still, the Democrats in Congress continue to pursue their bills, and now they have left Washington for spring recess without finishing the work.

Democrat leaders in Congress seem more interested in fighting political battles in Washington than in providing our troops what they need to fight the battles in Iraq. If Democrat leaders in Congress are bent on making a political statement, then they need to send me this unacceptable bill as quickly as possible when they come back. I'll veto it, and then Congress can get down to the business of funding our troops without strings and without delay.

If Congress fails to act in the next few weeks, it will have significant consequences for our men and women in the Armed Forces. As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Pace, recently stated during his testimony before a House subcommittee, if Congress fails to pass a bill I can sign by mid-April, the Army will be forced to consider cutting back on equipment, equipment repair, and quality of life initiatives for our Guard and Reserve forces. These cuts would be necessary because the money will have to be shifted to support the troops on the frontlines.

The Army also would be forced to consider curtailing some training for Guard and Reserve units here at home. This would reduce their readiness and could delay their avail-

ability to mobilize for missions in Afghanistan and Iraq. If Congress fails to pass a bill I can sign by mid-May, the problems grow even more acute. The Army would be forced to consider slowing or even freezing funding for its depots, where the equipment our troops depend on is repaired. They will also have to consider delaying or curtailing the training of some active duty forces, reducing the availability of these forces to deploy overseas. If this happens, some of the forces now deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq may need to be extended because other units are not ready to take their places.

If Congress does not act, the Army may also have to delay the formation of new brigade combat teams, preventing us from getting those troops into the pool of forces that are available to deploy. If these new teams are unavailable, we would have to ask other units to extend in the theater.

In a letter to Congress, Army Chief of Staff General Pete Schoomaker put it this way: "Without approval of the supplemental funds in April, we will be forced to take increasingly draconian measures, which will impact Army readiness and impose hardships on our soldiers and their families."

In a time of war, it's irresponsible for the Democrat leadership in—Democratic leadership in Congress to delay for months on end while our troops in combat are waiting for the funds. The bottom line is this: Congress's failure to fund our troops on the frontlines will mean that some of our military families could wait longer for their loved ones to return from the frontlines, and others could see their loved ones headed back to the war sooner than they need to. That is unacceptable to me, and I believe it is unacceptable to the American people.

Members of Congress say they support the troops. Now they need to show that support in deed as well as in word. Members of Congress are entitled to their views and should express them. Yet debating these differences should not come at the expense of funding our troops.

Congress's most basic responsibility is to give our troops the equipment and training they need to fight our enemies and protect our Nation. They're now failing in that responsibility, and if they do not change course

in the coming weeks, the price of that failure will be paid by our troops and their loved ones.

I'll now answer some questions, starting with Jennifer Loven [Associated Press].

Syria

Q. Thank you, sir. You've agreed to talk to Syria in the context of these international conferences on Iraq—

The President. Excuse me?

Q. You've agreed to talk to Syria in the context of the international conferences on Iraq. What's so different or wrong about Speaker Pelosi having her own meetings there? And are you worried that she might be preempting your own efforts?

The President. We have made it clear to high-ranking officials, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, that going to Syria sends mixed signals—signals in the region and, of course, mixed signals to President Asad. And by that, I mean, photo opportunities and/or meetings with President Asad lead the Asad Government to believe they're part of the mainstream of the international community, when, in fact, they're a state sponsor of terror; when, in fact, they're helping expedite—or at least not stopping the movement of foreign fighters from Syria into Iraq; when, in fact, they have done little to nothing to rein in militant Hamas and Hizballah; and when, in fact, they destabilize the Lebanese democracy.

There have been a lot of people who have gone to see President Asad—some Americans, but a lot of European leaders, high-ranking officials. And yet we haven't seen action. In other words, he hasn't responded. It's one thing to send a message; it's another thing to have the person receiving the message actually do something. So the position of this administration is that the best way to meet with a leader like Asad or people from Syria is in the larger context of trying to get the global community to help change his behavior. But sending delegations hasn't worked. It's just simply been counter-productive.

Steve [Steve Holland, Reuters].

British Military Personnel Held in Iran

Q. Thank you, sir. Would the U.S. be willing to give up 5 Iranians held in Iraq if it would help persuade Iran to give up the 15 British sailors?

The President. Steven, I said the other day that—first of all, the seizure of the sailors is indefensible by the Iranians and that I support the Blair Government's attempts to solve this issue peacefully. So we're in close consultation with the British Government. I also strongly support the Prime Minister's declaration that there should be no quid pro quos when it comes to the hostages.

Let's see here—Baker, Baker [Peter Baker, Washington Post]. Are you here? Yes, there you are.

Department of Justice

Q. Sir, your administration evaluated all 93 U.S. attorneys, in part on the basis of loyalty. That was one of the criteria that was used. What role should loyalty to you play in the evaluation of those charged with administering justice and enforcing the law?

The President. Peter, obviously, when you name a U.S. attorney, you want somebody who can do the job. That's the most important criterion, somebody who is qualified, somebody who can get a job done. The President names the U.S. attorneys, and the President has the right to remove U.S. attorneys. And on this particular issue, the one you're referring to, I believe it's the current issue of the U.S.—eight U.S. attorneys. They serve at my pleasure. They have served 4-year terms, and we have every right to replace them. And—

Q. And what—

The President. Let me finish, please. I am genuinely concerned about their reputations, now that this has become a Washington, DC, focus. I'm sorry it's come to this. On the other hand, there had been no credible evidence of any wrongdoing. And that's what the American people have got to understand. We had a right to remove them; we did remove them. And there will be more hearings to determine what I've just said, no credible evidence of wrongdoing.

Bill [Bill Plante, CBS News].

Iraq/Situation in Baghdad

Q. Mr. President, a lot of the disagreement over—

The President. Wrong Bill.

Q. Which one, him?

The President. No, you. The cute-looking one. [*Laughter*]

Q. Thanks so much. A lot of the disagreement, sir, over the way you're handling Iraq, disagreements from the public and Congress, stems from the belief that things are not working, despite the surge. The Iraqis have met few, if any, of the benchmarks that were laid down for them so far. Senator McCain walked in the Baghdad marketplace with air cover and a company of troops. But people don't believe that this can work, and they question the continued sacrifice of U.S. troops to help make it work.

The President. Yes. Bill, I'm very aware that there are a group of people that don't think we should be there in the first place. There are some who don't believe that this strategy will work. I've listened carefully to their complaints. Obviously, I listened to these concerns prior to deciding to reinforce. This is precisely the debate we had inside the White House: Can we succeed? I know there are some who have basically said, it is impossible to succeed. I strongly disagree with those people. I believe not only can we succeed; I know we must succeed.

And so I decided to, at the recommendation of military commanders, decided to send reinforcements. As opposed to leaving Baghdad and watching the country go up in flames, I chose a different route, which is to send more troops into Baghdad. And General Petraeus, who is a reasoned, sober man, says there is some progress being made. And he cites murders and—in other words, there's some calm coming to the capital. But he also fully recognizes, as do I, it's still dangerous. In other words, suiciders are willing to kill innocent life in order to send the projection that this is an impossible mission.

The whole strategy is to give the Iraqi Government time to reconcile, time to unify the country, time to respond to the demands of the 12 million people that voted.

You've said the Iraqis haven't met any obligations; I would disagree with your characterization. They have said that they will send

Iraqi forces into Baghdad to take the lead, along with U.S. troops, to bring security to Baghdad, and they've done that. They said they'd name a commander for Baghdad; they have done that. They said they'd send up—they'd send troops out into the neighborhoods to clear and hold and then build; they're doing that. They said they would send a budget up that would spend a considerable amount of their money on reconstruction; they have done that. They're working on an oil law that is in progress.

As a matter of fact, I spoke to the Prime Minister yesterday about progress on the oil law. He reminded me that sometimes the legislature doesn't do what the executive branch wants them to do. I reminded him, I understand what he's talking about. But, nevertheless, I strongly agree that we've got to continue to make it clear to the Iraqi Government that this is—the solution to Iraq, an Iraq that can govern itself, sustain itself, and defend itself, is more than a military mission—precisely the reason why I sent more troops into Baghdad, to be able to provide some breathing space for this democratically elected Government to succeed. And it's hard work, and I understand it's hard work.

Secondly, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, Bill, there's only 40 percent of our troops that are there on the ground. And that's why I find it somewhat astounding that people in Congress would start calling for withdrawal even before all the troops have made it to Baghdad.

Let's see here—Rutenberg. Jim Rutenberg [New York Times].

Public Opinion/War in Iraq

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. Matthew Dowd, your chief campaign strategist in 2004, kind of issued a strong critique of you and your administration this weekend. I'm wondering if you were personally stung, and if you worry about losing support of people—of him and people like him?

The President. First of all, I respect Matthew. I've known him for awhile. As you mentioned, he was an integral part of my 2004 campaign. I have not talked to Matthew about his concerns. Nevertheless, I understand his anguish over war. I understand that this is an emotional issue for Matthew, as

it is a lot of other people in our country. Matthew's case, as I understand it, is obviously intensified because his son is deployable. In other words, he's got a son in the U.S. Armed Forces, and, I mean, I can understand Matthew's concerns.

I would hope that people who share Matthew's point of view would understand my concern about what failure would mean to the security of the United States. What I'm worried about is that we leave before the mission is done—and that is a country that is able to govern, sustain, and defend itself—and that Iraq becomes a cauldron of chaos, which will embolden extremists, whether they be Shi'a or Sunni extremists; which would enable extremists to have safe haven from which to plot attacks on America; which could provide new resources for an enemy that wants to harm us.

And so, on the one hand, I do fully understand the anguish people go through about this war. And it's not just Matthew; there's a lot of our citizens who are concerned about this war. But I also hope that people will take a sober look at the consequences of failure in Iraq. My main job is to protect the people, and I firmly believe that if we were to leave before the job is done, the enemy would follow us here. And what makes Iraq different from previous struggles is that September the 11th showed that chaos in another part of the world—and/or safe haven for killers, for radicals—affects the security of the United States.

Martha [Martha Raddatz, ABC News].

Iran

Q. Back to Iran, sir. ABC has been reporting that Iran will be capable of building a nuclear bomb within 2 years. Have you seen evidence that Iran is accelerating its nuclear program?

The President. I haven't seen the report that you just referred to. I do share concerns about Iranian intention to have a nuclear weapon. I firmly believe that if Iran were to have a nuclear weapon, it would be a seriously destabilizing influence in the Middle East. And therefore, we have worked to build an international coalition to try to convince the Iranians to give up their weapon, to make it clear that they have choices to make—

whether the choice be isolation or missed opportunity to grow their economies. And so we take your—we take seriously the attempts of the Iranians to gain a nuclear weapon.

Q. Have you seen evidence of an acceleration, though?

The President. You know, I'm not going to talk about any intelligence that I've seen, one way or the other. But I do want you to know how seriously we take the Iranian nuclear issue. As a matter of fact, it is the cornerstone of our Iranian policy. It is—and that's why we spend a lot of time in working with friends, allies, concerned people to rally international support, to make it clear to the Iranian people that there is a better option for them.

Now, we have no problem, no beef with the Iranian people. We value their history; we value their traditions. But their Government is making some choices that will continue to isolate them and deprive them of a better economic future. So we take the issue very seriously.

Ken Herman [Cox News].

Price of Gasoline/Alternative Fuel Sources

Q. Thank you, sir. Mr. President, are you aware of the current price of a gallon of gas? Can you explain why it's gone up so sharply in recent weeks? And is there anything in the near future indicating the prices might start coming down again before the heavy summer driving season?

The President. About 2.60 plus. Gas—

Q. Where are you shopping, sir? [Laughter]

The President. Nationwide average. The price of gasoline, obviously, varies from region to region for a variety of reasons. Some has to do with the amount of taxation at the pump; some of it has to do with the boutique fuels that have been mandated on a State-by-State basis; but a lot of the price of gasoline depends on the price of crude oil.

And the price of crude oil is on the rise, and the price of crude oil is on the rise because people get spooked, for example, when it looks like there may be a crisis with a crude oil-producing nation like Iran. But the whole point about rising crude oil prices and rising gasoline prices is that this country ought to

work hard to get off our addiction to oil—all the more reason why Congress ought to pass the mandatory fuel standards that I set forth, which will reduce our use of gasoline by 20 percent over the next 10 years. And there's two reasons why. One is for national security concerns, and two is for environmental concerns. And I hope that we can get this done with the Congress, get it out of the Congress to my desk as quickly as possible.

Dancer. Dancing man. That would be David Gregory [NBC News]. For those of you not aware, Gregory put on a show the other—

Congressional Action on Emergency Supplemental Appropriations

Q. Everybody's aware, Mr. President, thank you. [*Laughter*]

The President. Well, maybe the listeners aren't.

Q. Yes, that's all right.

The President. That was a beautiful performance, seriously.

Q. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. President. [*Laughter*] Mr. President, you say the Democrats are undercutting troops, the way they have voted. They're obviously trying to assert more control over foreign policy. Isn't that what the voters elected them to do, in November?

The President. I think the voters in America want Congress to support our troops in—who are in harm's way. They want money to the troops. And they don't want politicians in Washington telling our generals how to fight a war. It's one thing to object to the policy, but it's another thing when you have troops in harm's way not to give them the funds they need.

And no question there's been a political dance going on here in Washington. You've followed this closely; you know what I'm talking about. Not only was there a political dance going on—in other words, people were trying to appeal to one side of their party or another—but they then had to bring out new funding streams in order to attract votes to an emergency war supplemental.

And my concern, David, is several. One, Congress shouldn't tell generals how to run the war; Congress should not shortchange

our military; Congress should not use an emergency war spending measure as a vehicle to put pet spending projects on that have nothing to do with the war.

Secondly, as I mentioned in these remarks, delays beyond mid-April and then into May will affect the readiness of the U.S. military. So my attitude is, enough politics. They need to come back, pass a bill. If they want to play politics, fine. They continue to do that; I will veto it. But they ought to do it quickly. They ought to get the bill to my desk as quickly as possible, and I'll veto it. And then we can get down to the business of funding our troops without strings and without withdrawal dates.

It is amazing to me that, one, the United States Senate passed a—confirmed General Petraeus overwhelmingly, after he testified as to what he thinks is necessary to succeed in Iraq, and then won't fund him. Secondly, we have put 40 percent of the reinforcements in place, and yet people already want to start withdrawing before the mission has had a chance to succeed.

They need to come off their vacation, get a bill to my desk, and if it's got strings and mandates and withdrawals and pork, I'll veto it. And then we can get down to the business of getting this thing done, and we can do it quickly. It doesn't have to take a lot of time. And we can get the bill—get the troops funded, and we go about our business of winning this war.

McKinnon [John McKinnon, Wall Street Journal].

Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency

Q. Thank you, Mr. President. On climate change and the decision that was issued yesterday by the U.S. Supreme Court, what's your reaction to that decision? And don't you think that this makes some kind of broad caps on greenhouse gas emissions more or less inevitable?

The President. First of all, the decision of the Supreme Court is—we take very seriously. It's the new law of the land. And secondly, we're taking some time to fully understand the details of the decision. As you know, this decision was focused on emissions that come from automobiles. My attitude is,

is that we have laid out a plan that will affect greenhouse gases that come from automobiles by having a mandatory fuel standard that insists upon 35—using 35 billion gallons of alternative fuels by 2017, which will reduce our gasoline usage by 20 percent and halt the growth in greenhouse gases that emanate from automobiles. In other words, there is a remedy available for Congress, and I strongly hope that they pass this remedy quickly.

In terms of the broader issue, first of all, I've taken this issue very seriously. I have said that it is a serious problem. I recognize that man is contributing greenhouse gases, that—but here are the principles by which I think we can get a good deal. One, anything that happens cannot hurt economic growth. And I say that because, one, I care about the working people of the country, but also because, in order to solve the greenhouse gas issue over a longer period of time, it's going to require new technologies, which tend to be expensive. And it's easier to afford expensive technologies if you're prosperous.

Secondly, whatever we do must be in concert with what happens internationally because we could pass any number of measures that are now being discussed in the Congress, but unless there is an accord with China, China will produce greenhouse gases that will offset anything we do in a brief period of time.

And so those are the principles that will guide our decisionmaking. How do you encourage new technology? How do you grow the economy? And how do you make sure that China is—and India are a part of a rational solution?

Let's see here—how about Bret Baier [FOX News]?

Homosexual Persons in the Military

Q. Mr. President, thank you. Since General Pace made his comments that got a lot of attention about homosexuality, we haven't heard from you on that issue. Do you, sir, believe that homosexuality is immoral?

The President. I will not be rendering judgment about individual orientation. I do believe the “don't ask, don't tell” policy is good policy.

Sammon [Bill Sammon, Washington Times], yes.

Congressional Action on Emergency Supplemental Appropriations/War on Terror

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. You're standing out there; I can see you.

Q. When Congress has linked war funding with a timetable, you have argued micro-management. When they've linked it to unrelated spending, you've argued porkbarrel. But now there's talk from Harry Reid and others that if you veto this bill, they may come back and just simply cut off funding. Wouldn't that be a legitimate exercise of a congressional authority, which is the power of the purse?

The President. The Congress is exercising its legitimate authority as it sees fit right now. I just disagree with their decisions. I think setting an artificial timetable for withdrawal is a significant mistake. It is a—it sends mixed signals, bad signals to the region and to the Iraqi citizens.

Listen, the Iraqis are wondering whether or not we're going to stay to help. People in America wonder whether or not they've got the political will to do the hard work—that's what Plante was asking about. My conversations with President [Prime Minister] * Maliki, he seems dedicated to doing that, and we will continue to work with him to achieve those objectives. But they're wondering whether or not America is going to keep commitments. And so when they hear withdrawal and timetables, it, rightly so, sends different kinds of signals.

It's interesting that Harry Reid, Leader Reid spoke out with a different option. Whatever option they choose, I would hope they get home, get a bill, and get it to my desk. And if it has artificial timetables of withdrawal or if it cuts off funding for troops or if it tells our generals how to run a war, I'll veto it. And then we can get about the business of giving our troops what they need—what our generals want them to have, and give our generals the flexibility necessary to

* White House correction.

achieve the objectives that we set out by reinforcing troops in Iraq.

You know, what's interesting is, you don't hear a lot of debate about Washington as to what will happen if there is failure. Again, Plante mentioned that people don't think we can succeed—in other words, there's no chance of succeeding. That's a part of the debate. But what people also have got to understand is what will happen if we fail. And the way you fail is to leave before the job is done; in other words, just abandon this young democracy—say, “We're tired; we'll withdraw from Baghdad,” and hope there's not chaos.

I believe that if this capital city were to fall into chaos, which is where it was headed prior to reinforcing, that there would be no chance for this young democracy to survive. That's why I made the decision I made. And the reason why I believe it's important to help this young democracy survive is so that the country has a chance to become a stabilizing influence in a dangerous part of the world.

I also understand that if the country—if the experience were to fail, radicals would be emboldened. People that had been—that can't stand America would find new ways to recruit. There would be potentially additional resources for them to use at their disposal.

The failure in Iraq would endanger American security. I have told the American people often, it is best to defeat them there so we don't have to face them here, fully recognizing that what happens over there can affect the security here. That's one of the major lessons of September the 11th. In that case, there was safe haven found in a failed state, where killers plotted and planned and trained and came and killed 3,000 of our citizens. And I vowed we weren't going to let that happen again.

Secondly, the way to defeat the ideology that these people believe is through a competing ideology, one based upon liberty and human rights and human dignity. And there are some who, I guess, say that's impossible to happen in the Middle East. I strongly disagree. I know it is hard work. I believe it is necessary work to secure this country in the long run.

Ed [Ed Henry, Cable News Network].

Cooperation With Congress/Legislative Agenda

Q. Mr. President, the conservative newspaper columnist, Robert Novak, recently wrote that in 50 years of covering Washington, he's never seen a President more isolated than you are right now. What do you say to critics like Novak who say that you are more isolated now than Richard Nixon was during Watergate?

The President. How did he define isolated?

Q. He said you're isolated primarily from your own party, that Republican leaders on the Hill were privately telling him that, on the Gonzales matter in particular, you're very isolated.

The President. I think you're going to find that the White House and the Hill are going to work in close collaboration, starting with this supplemental. When I announced that I will veto a bill with—that withdrew our troops, that set artificial timetables for withdrawal or micromanaged the war, the Republicans strongly supported that message. I think you'll find us working together on energy. They know what I know, that dependence on oil will affect the long-term national security of the country. We'll work together on No Child Left Behind. We'll work together on immigration reform. We'll work together, most importantly, on budget, to make sure this budget gets balanced without raising taxes.

The other day, the Democrats submitted budgets that raised taxes on the working people, in order to increase the amount of money they have available for spending. That is a place where the Republicans and this President are going to work very closely together. I adamantly oppose tax increases, and so do the majority of Members in the United States Congress.

Ed [Ed Chen, Los Angeles Times].

Homeland Security

Q. Mr. President, good morning. You've talked——

The President. Good morning. “Good morning,” that's a good way to start.

Q. You've talked about the consequences of failure in Iraq, and you've said that enemies would follow us home. I wonder, given

that, it seems like that's not exactly a ringing endorsement of people who are charged with the responsibility of keeping America safe. So what——

The President. What was that again, Ed?

Q. Well, you say that the enemies would follow us home if——

The President. I will—that's what they'll do, just like September the 11th. They plotted, planned, and attacked.

Q. So I wonder, in your own mind, how does that vision play out? How do they follow us home? Because we've spent so much money and put so much resources into making this country safer.

The President. Ed, I'm not going to predict to you the methodology they'll use. Just you need to know they want to hit us again. We do everything we can here at the homeland to protect us. That's why I've got a Homeland Security Department. That's why we are inconveniencing air traffickers, to make sure nobody is carrying weapons on airplanes. That's why we need border enforcement, with a comprehensive immigration bill, by the way, to make sure it's easier to enforce the border. I mean, we're doing a lot. That's why we need to make sure our intelligence services coordinate information better.

So we spend a lot of time trying to protect this country. But if they were ever to have safe haven, it would make the efforts much harder. That's my point. We cannot let them have safe haven again. The lesson of September the 11th is, if these killers are able to find safe haven from which to plot, plan, and attack, they would do so.

So, Ed, I don't know what methodology they'll use. We're planning for the worst. We cover all fronts. And it's hard to protect a big country like this, and I applaud those who have done a fantastic job of protecting us since September the 11th. But make no mistake about it, there's still an enemy that would like to do us harm. And I believe, whether it be in Afghanistan or in Iraq or anywhere else, if these enemy is able to find safe haven, it will endanger the lives of our fellow citizens.

I also understand that the best way to defeat them in the long run is to show people in the Middle East, for example, that there

is a better alternative to tyrannical societies, to societies that don't meet the hopes and aspirations of the average people. And that is through a society that is based upon the universal concept of liberty.

Iraq is a very important part of securing the homeland, and it's a very important part of helping change the Middle East into a part of the world that will not serve as a threat to the civilized world, to people like—or to the developed world, to people like—in the United States.

So thank you all very much for your interest. I hope you have a nice holiday. Appreciate it.

NOTE: The President's news conference began at 10:09 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to President Bashar al-Asad of Syria; Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom; Gen. David H. Petraeus, USA, commanding general, Multi-National Force—Iraq; Lt. Gen. Abboud Gambar, Iraqi commander of Baghdad, Iraqi Army; and Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki of Iraq. The Office of the Press Secretary also released a Spanish language transcript of these remarks.

Remarks to Military Personnel and Their Families at Fort Irwin, California

April 4, 2007

The President. Thank you, all. I've been waiting all day to say, "Hooah!"

Audience members. Hooah!

The President. Thank you for greeting me. General Cone, thanks. I appreciate your service to our country, and thanks for leading these men and women. I'm honored also to be with Jill. Thank you for joining us today for lunch. Command Sergeant Kim Boyink has been a generous host. Sarge, I appreciate being with you. Thank you for your service. Thanks for setting such a good example for the enlisted folks.

I often tell people that the backbone of the Army is the sergeant.

Audience members. Hooah!

The President. And I appreciate you sergeants who have joined us here, and I appreciate you serving.

I want to thank two Members of the United States Congress who have traveled with me today, men who have concerns about Fort Irwin and have reflected those concerns in different appropriations measures in the United States Congress. In other words, they understand the importance of this mission, and they understand the importance of making sure the folks who are stationed here have the best possible housing and food—could work a little bit on it, but—[*laughter*]. But I do want to introduce to you the Congressmen from this district, Congressman Buck McKeon—where are you, Buck? There he is. Thanks, Buck—and Congressman Jerry Lewis, ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

I'm proud to be here with Mayor Dale of the city of Barstow. I appreciate you coming, Mr. Mayor. It's nice of you to be here. Thanks for being here.

I appreciate not only those who wear the uniform who are here today; I want to thank your families, too, for coming. It means a lot to me to be with our military families. I'll say a word about our military families here in a minute.

I do want to thank those who have just returned from Afghanistan, the 699th Maintenance Company.

Audience members. Hooah!

The President. I guess the best words I can say are, welcome—I mean, thanks, and welcome back. We're glad you're here.

I appreciate those of you who are about to deploy in an important theater in this war against radicals and extremists, this war on terror: the "Red Devils" of the 58th Engineers, the "Renegades" of the 557th Maintenance Company, the "Super HET" of the 2nd Transportation Company. I appreciate your—[*applause*].

Ours is a remarkable country when people volunteer to serve our country in a time of war. The amazing thing about our United States military is, thousands and thousands have signed up knowing full well that we're a nation at war. The government didn't say, you have to do this; you choose—you chose to do it on your own. You decided to put your country ahead of self in many ways. I'm proud to be the Commander in Chief of such decent people, such honorable people, and

such noble people. And I'm proud to be in your presence today.

I also want to thank the families. I understand how difficult this war is on America's military families. I understand the rotations are difficult for the moms and husbands and sons and daughters. I understand that when a loved one is deployed, it creates anxiety. I also understand our military families are very supportive of those who wear the uniform. And so on behalf of a grateful nation, I say thanks to the families who are here and all across the United States of America. You're an integral part of making sure this volunteer army is as successful as it is today.

This country's life changed on September the 11th, 2001, and my attitude about the world changed that day too. I decided that I—that our most important task in Washington was to protect you, protect the American people. And I decided that I would use all the resources at our disposal to do that. Like many Americans, we struggle with understanding with what this attack meant. But if you think about the lead-up to the attack, you think about the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in 1993 or the extremist attack on our troops in Lebanon or the Embassies in Africa, Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, or the USS *Cole*.

In other words, the attack on September the 11th wasn't the first move by the extremists. As a matter of fact, they conducted their acts of murder believing that there wouldn't be a response. They became convinced that free nations were weak, and they grew bolder believing that history was on their side.

After the attacks of September the 11th, I vowed to our country that we wouldn't tire, that we would use whatever it took to protect us. And so we changed our strategy. The strategy is to defeat the enemy overseas so we don't have to face them here at home. The strategy is to find those who would kill Americans and bring them to justice. So for those of you in—who have been in Afghanistan, you're helping this young democracy recover from a period of time in which brutal extremists provided safe haven to an enemy which attacked the United States. Part of our doctrine is, if you harbor a terrorist, you're equally as guilty as the terrorists.

Another part of the doctrine is, when you see a threat, we must take threats seriously, before they come here to hurt us. See, what changed on September the 11th is, oceans can no longer protect the people in the United States from harm. I saw a threat in Saddam Hussein. The world is better off without Saddam Hussein in power, and so are the citizens of Iraq.

In the long term, we must remember that freedom is universal, and the best way to defeat an ideology—and make no mistake about it, these extremists believe things. For example, they don't believe you can worship freely; they don't believe you should speak your mind; they don't believe in dissent; they don't believe in human rights. We believe in the right for people to worship. We believe in the dignity of each human being. Our ideology is based on the universality of liberty. Their dark ideology is based upon hatred. And the way to defeat—ultimately defeat those who would do harm to America is, give people a chance to live in a free society. And that's the work we're doing, whether it be in Afghanistan or in Iraq. And I want to thank you for your sacrifice and service.

Iraq, obviously, has got the attention of the United States, as it should. It's a tough war. The American people are weary of this war. They're wondering whether or not we can succeed. They're horrified by the suicide bombings they see.

I analyzed all the situation here this fall. I listened to the advice from the military; I listened to the advice from the political people—all in reaction to the fact that Al Qaida and the extremists bombed a sacred place, which caused sectarian violence to begin to rage. And it looked like that if action wasn't taken, the capital of this young democracy would be overwhelmed by chaos.

And I had a choice to make, and that is whether or not to pull back and hope that chaos wouldn't spread, or to do something about the sectarian violence that was taking place and to help the Iraqis bring order to their capital in order to give them breathing space, time to reconcile their differences after having lived under the thumb of a tyrant for years.

In weighing the options, I thought about the consequences of a country that could sus-

tain itself and defend itself and serve as an ally in the war on terror. And those consequences will have profound impact over the next years, over the decades, to know that in the midst of the Middle East, there can flourish free societies, societies where people can live together, societies where people can express their opinions, societies where people can live a free life. That's important because history has proven, has shown that free societies don't war with each other. But it's also important to have allies in this war against the extremists who would do us harm.

I've also thought about the consequences of failure and what it would mean to the American people. If chaos were to reign in the capital of that country, it could spill out to the rest of the country. It could then spill out to the region, where you would have religious extremists fighting each other with one common enemy, the United States of America—or our ally, for example, like Israel.

The enemy that had done us harm would be emboldened. They would have seen the mighty United States of America retreat before the job was done, which would enable them to better recruit. They have made it clear—"they" being people like Usama bin Laden or Zawahiri—have made it clear they want to drive us from Iraq to establish safe haven in order to launch further attacks. In my judgment, defeat—leaving before the job was done, which I would call defeat—would make this United States of America at risk to further attack.

In other words, this is a war in which, if we were to leave before the job is done, the enemy would follow us here. That's the lesson of September the 11th. It's an integral part of my thinking about how to secure this country—to do the most important job that the government must do, and that is to protect the American people.

So I made a decision, in consultation with our military commanders, people of sound military judgment, people who have made a career about how to set strategies in place to achieve military victories. And the new strategy we developed was to, rather than retreat, reinforce; rather than pull back was to go in with additional troops to help this young democracy do the job that the 12 million people who voted in free elections want

them to do, which is to provide security so a mother can raise her child the way we would want our mothers to be able to raise our children, to provide security so that the political reconciliation necessary can go forward in a more secure environment.

As I made the decision to send in more troops, I also made the decision to send in a new commander, General David Petraeus. He's an expert on counterinsurgency. Right now about half of the reinforcements that are expected to go to Baghdad have arrived. American and Iraqi troops are, however, on the move. They're rounding up both Shi'a and Sunni extremists; they're rounding up those who would do harm to innocent people.

We're after Al Qaida. After all, Al Qaida wants us to fail because they can't stand the thought of a free society in their midst. We're destroying car bomb factories, killing and capturing hundreds of insurgents, and neighborhoods are being reclaimed. There is progress, but the enemy sees that progress, and they're responding in a brutal way.

I was amazed by the story of the extremists who put two children into a automobile so that they could make it into a crowded area. Then they got of the car and blew up the car with the children inside. It only hardens my resolve to help free Iraq from a society in which people can do that to children. And it makes me realize the nature of the enemy that we face, which hardens my resolve to protect the American people. The people who do that are not people—you know, it's not a civil war; it is pure evil. And I believe we have an obligation to protect ourselves from that evil. So while we're making progress, it also is tough. And so the way to deal with it is to stay on the offense, is to help these Iraqis.

I had a meeting, a SVTS—what they call a SVTS, it's a real-time video conference—with Prime Minister Maliki. I urged him, of course, to continue making the actions necessary to reconcile in their society: pass an oil law, a de-Ba'athification law. It's interesting to watch a government emerge. It's interesting to watch this new democracy begin to take on responsibilities. And they are. They said they would commit additional troops into Baghdad; they have. They said

they'd name a commander for the city of Baghdad; they did. They said they would man checkpoints; they are. They said they'd spend a significant amount of their own money for their reconstruction; they have—budgeted \$10 billion.

And there's more work to be done, and I reminded the Prime Minister of that. And I reminded him that our patience is not unlimited. I also reminded him that we want him to succeed, that it's in the interest of the United States that this young democracy succeed. It's in the interest we gain a new ally in the war on terror in the midst of a part of the world that produced 19 kids that came and killed 3,000 of our citizens.

Just as the strategy is starting to make inroads, a narrow majority in the Congress passed legislation they knew all along I would not accept. Their bills impose an artificial deadline for withdrawal from Iraq. Their bills substitute the judgment of Washington politicians for the judgment of our military commanders. Their bills add billions of dollars in porkbarrel spending, spending that is unrelated to the war that you're engaged in. Then, instead of sending an acceptable bill to my desk, they went on spring break.

In the meantime, the clock is ticking for our military. The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chief of Staff of the Army have warned that if Congress delays these funds past mid-April, we'll have significant consequences for our Armed Forces. Army Chief of Staff says this: "Without approval of the supplemental funds in April, we will be forced to take increasingly draconian measures, which will impact Army readiness and impose hardship on our soldiers and their families."

For example, the Army says that without these funds, it will be forced to consider cutting back on training for Guard and Reserve units and, eventually, for active duty personnel. The folks at Fort Irwin know firsthand how important training is. Washington has a responsibility to ensure that you have the resources you need to keep this training going.

Soon Congress will return from its break. I urge them to work on legislation to fund our troops but that does not tell our military how to conduct war and sets an artificial

timetable for withdrawal. The enemy does not measure the conflict in Iraq in terms of timetables. They plan to fight us, and we've got to fight them, alongside the Iraqis. A strategy that encourages this enemy to wait us out is dangerous. It's dangerous for our troops; it's dangerous for our country's security. And it's not going to become the law.

There are fine, fine people debating this issue in Washington, DC. They're patriotic. They're people who have got passionate points of view about this war, and I understand that. Yet we cannot allow honest differences in Washington to harm our troops in battle or their families here at home. Members of Congress have sent their message. Now they need to send me a war spending measure that I can sign into law, so we can provide our troops and their families with the funds and support they deserve and they need.

I spent some time with the soldiers out in the field, and I want to share with you what I told them. The work that you have volunteered to do will have a lasting impact on the world in which we live. When we succeed in helping this Iraqi Government become a country that can sustain itself, defend itself, govern itself, and serve as an ally in the war on terror, we will have delivered a significant blow to those who have designs on harming the American people, because they can't stand the thought of free societies in their midst. They can't stand the thought of people being able to have a government of, by, and for the people. It is the opposite of what they view.

But we have done this kind of work before. The United States of America has done the kind of work that spread liberty in parts of the world where people never thought liberty could take hold. For example, after World War II, after we had a brutal war with the Japanese and Nazi Germany, our troops stayed behind and helped these societies recover and grow and prosper. And now we're reaping the benefits of helping our former enemies realize the blessings of liberty. Europe is free and at peace.

You know, after the Korean war, if you had asked somebody, "Can you imagine an American President being able to stand up in front of some troops and say, 'The Far

East is peaceful; a part of the world where we lost thousands of our troops in World War II and Korea is now a relatively peaceful part of the world.' " They would have said, "What a hopeless idealist that person is." And yet I can report to you that. And I believe it is because our troops not only helped in Korea and helped rebuild Japan, but I believe it's because the presence of the United States gave breathing space to people to realize the blessings of liberty.

I believe liberty is universal. I don't believe it is just for the United States of America alone. I believe there is an Almighty, and I believe the Almighty's gift to people worldwide is the desire to be free. And I think, if given a chance, people will seize that moment. And that's the work you're doing.

And so that's why I report to our citizens that the hard work we're doing today is laying the foundation of peace for generations to come. And it gives me great confidence to know that standing with the President of the United States is a fantastic military, well-trained, courageous, and dedicated to protecting this country.

I'm proud to be your Commander in Chief. May God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:19 p.m. In his remarks, he referred to Brig. Gen. Robert W. Cone, USA, commanding general, U.S. Army National Training Center and Fort Irwin, and his wife, Jill; Command Sgt. Maj. Kim D. Boyink, USA, U.S. Army National Training Center and Fort Irwin; Usama bin Laden, leader of the Al Qaida terrorist organization; Ayman Al-Zawahiri, founder of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad and senior Al Qaida associate; Lt. Gen. David H. Petraeus, USA, commanding general, Multi-National Force—Iraq; Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki of Iraq; Lt. Gen. Abboud Gambar, Iraqi commander of Baghdad, Iraqi Army; and Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates.

Statement on the Death of Edward G. Robinson *April 4, 2007*

Laura and I are saddened to learn of the death of Eddie Robinson. Eddie Robinson was a football legend who compiled an amazing record as the coach at Grambling State University. He will be remembered for his

passion for the game and his dedication to helping his players better themselves on the field, in the classroom, and in their communities. Laura and I extend our deepest sympathies to the Robinson family, the players he inspired, and Grambling State University.

**Executive Order 13429—
Establishing an Emergency Board To
Investigate a Dispute Between
Metro-North Railroad and Its
Maintenance of Way Employees
Represented by the International
Brotherhood of Teamsters**

April 4, 2007

A dispute exists between Metro-North Railroad and its maintenance of way employees represented by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

The dispute has not heretofore been adjusted under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended, 45 U.S.C. 151–188 (the “Act”).

A first emergency board to investigate and report on this dispute and disputes of other employees represented by other labor organizations was established on December 7, 2006, by Executive Order 13417 of December 6, 2006. The emergency board terminated upon issuance of its report. Subsequently, its recommendations were not accepted by the parties.

A party empowered by the Act has requested that the President establish a second emergency board pursuant to section 9A of the Act (45 U.S.C. 159a).

Section 9A(e) of the Act provides that the President, upon such request, shall appoint a second emergency board to investigate and report on the dispute.

Now, Therefore, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including section 9A of the Act, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Establishment of Emergency Board (Board). There is established, effective April 6, 2007, a Board of three members to be appointed by the President to investigate and report on this dispute. No member shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested

in any organization of railroad employees or any carrier. The Board shall perform its functions subject to the availability of funds.

Sec. 2. Report. Within 30 days after the creation of the Board, the parties to the dispute shall submit to the Board final offers for settlement of the dispute. Within 30 days after the submission of final offers for settlement of the dispute, the Board shall submit a report to the President setting forth its selection of the most reasonable offer.

Sec. 3. Maintaining Conditions. As provided by section 9A(h) of the Act, from the time a request to establish a second emergency board is made until 60 days after the Board submits its report to the President, the parties to the controversy shall make no change in the conditions out of which the dispute arose except by agreement of the parties.

Sec. 4. Records Maintenance. The records and files of the Board are records of the Office of the President and upon the Board’s termination shall be maintained in the physical custody of the National Mediation Board.

Sec. 5. Expiration. The Board shall terminate upon the submission of the report provided for in section 2 of this order.

George W. Bush

The White House,
April 4, 2007.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register,
11:01 a.m., April 9, 2007]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 10.

**Proclamation 8120—Pan American
Day and Pan American Week, 2007**

April 5, 2007

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

Each year on Pan American Day and during Pan American Week, we underscore our commitment to supporting the citizens in the Pan American community, strengthening democracy in the Western Hemisphere, and advancing the cause of peace worldwide.

In 1890, the International Union of American Republics was established to promote cooperation among the Americas. Today, the United States and our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere are a community linked by common values, shared interests, and the close bonds of family and friendship. As the expansion of freedom continues in our region, the democratic nations of the Western Hemisphere are working together to build a safer and more prosperous society and to ensure that all the people of the Americas have the opportunity to achieve their dreams.

My Administration is working to advance the cause of social justice in the Pan American region, and we are committed to supporting our neighbors' efforts to meet the needs of their citizens. In 2004, we created the Millennium Challenge Corporation to provide increased aid to nations that govern justly, invest in the education and health of their people, and promote economic freedom. We are working with the citizens of the Pan American community to expand economic opportunity through debt relief and to encourage reforms through such mechanisms as the North America Free Trade Agreement, the Chile Free Trade Agreement, and the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement. These agreements facilitate the flow of trade and help establish market economies. We have also recently notified the Congress of our intention to enter into a free trade agreement with Panama and signed free trade agreements with Peru and Colombia. These agreements will generate export opportunities for the United States and benefit the people of Panama, Peru, and Colombia by providing economic opportunity and helping to strengthen democratic institutions. By working with our democratic neighbors to build strong and vibrant economies, we are helping the citizens of the Western Hemisphere realize the promise of a free and just society.

The ties between the democratic nations of the Western Hemisphere are deep and lasting, and together we can continue our great strides toward freedom and prosperity for people everywhere.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush,
President of the United States of America,

by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 14, 2007, as Pan American Day and April 8 through April 14, 2007, as Pan American Week. I urge the Governors of the 50 States, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the officials of other areas under the flag of the United States of America to honor these observances with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of April, in the year of our Lord two thousand seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-first.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:47 a.m., April 6, 2007]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 9.

Proclamation 8121—National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day, 2007

April 5, 2007

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

The men and women of the United States Armed Forces have made great sacrifices to defend our Nation. They have triumphed over brutal enemies, liberated continents, and answered the prayers of millions around the globe. On National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day, we honor the brave individuals who put service above self and were taken captive while protecting America and advancing the cause of freedom.

Throughout our Nation's conflicts, American prisoners of war have defied ruthless enemies and endured tremendous hardships as they braved captivity. Their strength showed the power and resilience of the American spirit and the indomitable character of our men and women in uniform. Their sacrifices are a great example of courage, devotion, and love of country.

Our Nation's former prisoners of war have helped secure the priceless gift of freedom for all our citizens, and we will always be grateful to them and their families. On National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day and throughout the year, we honor the American heroes who have been taken as prisoners of war and remember their legacy of bravery and selflessness.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim April 9, 2007, as National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day. I call upon the people of the United States to join me in honoring the service and sacrifices of all American prisoners of war. I call upon Federal, State, and local government officials and private organizations to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifth day of April, in the year of our Lord two thousand seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-first.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:47 a.m., April 6, 2007]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 9.

Message on the Observance of Easter 2007

April 6, 2007

"Rejoice!"

Matthew 28:9

Laura and I send greetings to all those celebrating the glorious Easter holiday.

The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is the most important event of the Christian faith. Easter morning holds wonder and promise, and it is a chance for people everywhere to gather with family and friends to celebrate the power of love conquering death. In this season of renewal, we can rejoice in Christ's rising, draw strength and inspiration from

His example, and remember that in the end, even death itself will be defeated.

This Easter we pray for all our men and women in uniform and for the military families whose loved ones are deployed on important missions in distant lands. We remember especially those who have given their lives in freedom's cause.

On this powerful day, let us join together and give thanks to the Almighty for the glory of His grace.

Happy Easter, and may God bless you.

George W. Bush

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Proclamation 8122—400th Anniversary of Jamestown, 2007

April 6, 2007

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Four centuries ago, after a long journey, a small group of colonists stepped boldly onto the shores of the New World and established the first permanent English settlement in North America. During the 400th anniversary of Jamestown, America honors the early pioneers whose epic of endurance and courage started the story of our Nation.

The ideals that distinguish and guide the United States today trace back to the Virginia settlement where free enterprise, the rule of law, and the spirit of discovery took hold in the hearts and practices of the American people. Noble institutions and grand traditions were established in Jamestown. Amid tremendous difficulties, a determined few worked the land and expanded into the wilderness. Without knowing it, the colonists who built communities at Jamestown laid the foundation for a Nation that would become the ultimate symbol and force for freedom throughout the entire world.

Much has changed in the 400 years since that three-sided fort was raised on the banks of the James River. Today, we are a strong and growing Nation of more than 300 million, and we are blessed to live in a land of

plenty during a time of great prosperity. The long struggle that started at Jamestown has inspired generations of Americans. Advancing the right to live, work, and worship in liberty is the mission that created our country, the honorable achievement of our ancestors, and the calling of our time.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim 2007 as the 400th Anniversary of Jamestown. I encourage all Americans to commemorate this milestone by honoring the courage of those who came before us, participating in appropriate programs and celebrations, and visiting this historic site with family and friends.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this sixth day of April, in the year of our Lord two thousand seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-first.

George W. Bush

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:52 a.m., April 10, 2007]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on April 11.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

March 31

In the morning, at Camp David, MD, the President had an intelligence briefing.

In the afternoon, the President and Mrs. Bush participated in an arrival ceremony for President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva of Brazil. Later, he and President Lula da Silva had a meeting.

April 1

In the morning, the President and Mrs. Bush returned to Washington, DC, arriving in the afternoon.

April 2

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing.

The President declared a major disaster in New Mexico and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms and tornadoes on March 23–24.

April 3

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, he met with Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates.

April 4

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. Later, he traveled to Fort Irwin, CA, arriving in the afternoon.

In the afternoon, the President participated in a briefing and demonstration at the U.S. Army National Training Center. He then had lunch with military personnel and their families. Later, he met with family members of soldiers killed in Iraq.

Later in the afternoon, the President traveled to Los Angeles, CA, where, upon arrival, he met with USA Freedom Corps volunteer Hannah Locke. Later, at a private residence, he attended a Republican National Committee reception.

In the evening, the President traveled to the Bush Ranch in Crawford, TX.

The White House announced that the President and Mrs. Bush will welcome Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan to the White House on April 26, and on April 27 the President and Prime Minister Abe will meet at Camp David, MD.

The President announced his intention to nominate Charles L. English to be Ambassador to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The President announced his intention to nominate Miriam K. Hughes to be Ambassador to Micronesia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Cameron P. Munter to be Ambassador to Serbia.

The President announced his intention to nominate Robert B. Nolan to be Ambassador to Lesotho.

The President announced his intention to nominate John L. Withers II to be Ambassador to Albania.

The President announced his intention to nominate Robert M. Couch to be General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The President announced his intention to nominate Michael J. Kussman to be Under Secretary for Health at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The President announced his intention to nominate Peter B. McCarthy to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Management) and, upon appointment, to designate him as Chief Financial Officer.

The President announced his intention to nominate Dennis R. Schrader to be Deputy Administrator for National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency at the Department of Homeland Security.

The President announced his intention to nominate Michael G. Vickers to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, and Interdependent Capabilities).

The President announced his intention to appoint Jeffrey Scott Wilpon as a member of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

The President announced his intention to appoint the following individuals as members of the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations: Calvin M. Dooley; Edward Charles Emma; John Engler; William Eldridge Frenzel; Nicholas Giordano; Mark Raymond Kennedy; Scott Klug; James Winston Morrison; Stephen Withrow Sanger; Jose Antonio Villamil; and James L. Ziemer.

The President announced his intention to recess appoint Andrew G. Biggs as Deputy Commissioner of Social Security.

The President announced his intention to recess appoint Susan E. Dudley as Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs at the Office of Management and Budget.

The President announced his intention to recess appoint Sam Fox as Ambassador to Belgium.

The President announced his intention to recess appoint Carol Waller Pope as a member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

The President announced that he has appointed Mark Carew Treanor as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

April 5

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing. He then had a telephone conversation with Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom.

April 6

In the morning, the President had an intelligence briefing.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released March 31

Statement by the Deputy Press Secretary on Congressional action on emergency supplemental appropriations

Released April 2

Transcript of a press briefing by Deputy Press Secretary Dana Perino

Statement by the Deputy Press Secretary on disaster assistance to New Mexico

Released April 3

Statement by the Deputy Press Secretary on a U.S. delegation traveling to North Korea

to facilitate the return of remains of missing servicemen

Released April 4

Transcript of a press gaggle by National Security Council Press Secretary Gordon Johndroe

Statement by the Deputy Press Secretary: Visit of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan

Fact sheet: President Bush Meets With Military Personnel and Their Families at Ft. Irwin

Released April 5

Transcript of a press gaggle by National Security Council Press Secretary Gordon Johndroe

Released April 6

Transcript of a press briefing by White House Office of Science and Technology

Policy Associate Director Sharon L. Hays and White House Council on Environmental Quality Chairman James L. Connaughton on the Second International Panel on Climate Change

Fact sheet: Job Creation Continues—More Than 7.8 Million Jobs Created Since August 2003

**Acts Approved
by the President**

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.